

**Detailed Meeting Notes  
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board  
Novato Police Station Meeting Room  
Novato, California  
October 13, 2004**

**Attendance**

**RAB Members Present:**

Ed Keller; Jennifer Valenzia; Preston Cook; Joan Dekelboum; Jeff Johnston; Richard Draeger; Mathew McCarron; William McNicholas; Naomi Feger; Laurent Meillier; Lance McMahan; Jim McAlister; Sabrina Molinari; Marucia Britto; Ross Millerick; Patricia Eklund; Sue Lattanzio

**RAB Members Absent**

Manuel Meir; Ray Zimny; Tunstall Lang; Theresa McGarry

**Others Present:**

Eric Polson; Joy Lanzaro; Cara Naiditch; Jim Davies; Liz Barr; Travis Williamson; Harvey Abernathy, Calvin Willhite; Vic Canby; Kathleen Freeman; John Kaiser; John Valenzuela; Gina Lynch; Hugh Ashley

**Welcoming Remarks**

Ed Keller welcomed the community to the October 13, 2004 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

**Navy BRAC Update: Jennifer Valenzia, DODHF Novato BEC**

Ms. Valenzia presented the Navy's update on the NEX gas station, the Navy Ballfields, and the resale property transfer.

Hamilton Square (formerly the Sale Area) is now available for auction. The auction opened yesterday morning and is being handled by the General Administrative Services. A closing date has not been determined; it could be weeks or months. The FOST on the Novato Unified School District (NUSD) and Marin County Office of Education (MCOE) parcels has been finalized. The FOST was finalized by the Navy on August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2004. The property will be available to NUSD and MCOE once they finish their school facilities program. In the interim, the property will be assigned to the Department of Education, which will be the issuing agency for the property.

Mathew McCarron: Is the area next door where there was a leak?

Jennifer Valenzia: Yes. There were releases from the underground storage tank on the sale parcel as well as where the former PWC gas station was located.

Jeff Johnson: Have any bids been made on the property? In the Marin Independent Journal yesterday there was an article about the site and how it

was for sale. The article indicated that the city did not want to purchase the site because of the plume. Is there validity to that?

Jennifer Valenzia: There is one registered bidder at this point. There is a \$100,000 deposit required to make a bid, and one has been made. I understand that the City of Novato (City) decided to not purchase the property in lieu of economic considerations as well as the soil management requirements.

Pat Elkund: The City chose not to exercise the option to purchase the parcel because the Navy would not remove the building nor remediate the soil of the building footprint. The City did not want the liability of the project, and tried to work with the Navy to get them to remediate the site and remove the building. The Navy and Regulatory agencies agreed about not removing the building.

Matthew McCarron: When the site is closed, isn't there remediation done?

Laurent Meillier: Yes, when we close sites, we require the responsible party to clean up the area. The soil has been removed in the area of the footprint of the tanks, but not underneath the building. We feel the levels of contaminants are not consequential. If there will be further developments on the site, the owner will have to address excavation of the soil from 3 feet below ground surface to an appropriate depth below the building, and from 5 feet below ground surface for areas which are not in the building footprint.

Matthew McCarron: Did you clean the site up to a commercial zoning standard?

Laurent Meillier: Yes, there are different requirements depending on the land use zoning in the area. The soil was not removed below the building because it was undecided if the building was going to be removed.

Matthew McCarron: Is there a possibility of there being a point source within the building that is contributing to the plume?

Laurent Meillier: I don't think the contamination below the building is as high as where the tanks were located. The contamination should be attenuated due to distance. Contamination due to gasoline decreases over time, and we have not found high levels of benzene or gasoline in the groundwater, only MTBE, which the biosparging system addresses.

Jim Davies: The bulk of the contamination under the foundations of the gas station buildings are oil and diesel, and those are not a mobile problem. There is some residual contamination between the building at C Street and where the tanks were located. While that contamination is not a threat to the groundwater, if you were to dig in that area appropriate measures would be required. The estimated cost of the appropriate measures is approximately \$300,000. The developer, along with the City, felt that the property was too expensive with all of the remediation required.

Sue Lattanzio: I am confused about the use restrictions of the property.

Jennifer Valenzia: This is a city issue and not related to the pollution. We cleaned up the property so that it would be suitable for commercial use.

The Navy met with the regulatory agencies in August to discuss the biosparging system. We collected the quarterly groundwater samples in August. We monitor certain wells monthly that are near the treatment system and monitor a larger network of wells quarterly. We also simultaneously collect soil gas samples. In the two years that we have been running the system, we have not encountered any soil gas concentrations that have raised any red flags.

### **Brief History of Biosparging Operation**

The biosparging operation began in September 2002, and was anticipated to meet the performance goals in 18 months. The system has now been operating for 22 months. The system was optimized several times, meaning that the Navy has made adjustments to further reduce contaminants. As anticipated, there have been fluctuations in MTBE concentrations. Due to the heterogeneity of the subsurface, some areas are easier to treat than others. As of June 2004, the overall MTBE concentration has decreased by 80 percent.

### **Remedial Action Objectives and Performance Goals**

The Remedial Action objectives are the requirements that the Navy needed to meet in the board order.

- Stabilize and contain the higher concentration MTBE plume on Navy property
- Reduce and remediate MTBE and benzene concentrations in groundwater
- 95-99 percent reduction of dissolved MTBE concentrations in performance monitoring wells
- Establish a stable or shrinking MTBE plume on Navy property
- Achieve asymptotic removal after appropriate optimization of the biosparging system
- Operate as long as cost effective

Jeff Johnson: Who determines the cost effectiveness of the biosparging?

Jennifer Valenzia: The Navy and the regulatory agencies determine the cost effectiveness of the system. Biosparging costs \$15,000/month and we are currently experiencing diminishing returns. We will work with the regulatory agencies to determine if the system needs to be turned off.

Jeff Johnson: If the system is turned off, is there a possibility that the plume could return or is there an adverse effect to shutting down the system?

Jennifer Valenzia: We have removed the source, so there is nothing left to contribute to the contamination. When we turn off the system, there might be some fluctuations in the plume but not a drastic increase. The biosparging system simply speeds up the natural process of oxygen permeating the soils. Once we turn off the system, we will still be monitoring quarterly, and will be prepared to either turn the system back on or implement other measures. At the

southern end of the plume, where the gas station parcel is, the concentrations are still decreasing even though there is no treatment in that area at the present time.

MTBE concentrations on Navy property have reduced 79 percent since 2002 and 96 percent since 1996. Benzene concentrations on Navy property have reduced 54 percent since 2002 and 99.7 percent since 1996.

Maurcia Britto: Why are there fluctuations in the percent reductions on the various collection dates?

Jennifer Valenzia: Due to the frequency of our monitoring, we see all of the little ups and downs, but they are not very large due to the fact that we are referring to parts per billion.

Matthew McCarron: Are the total percent reductions in the plume encapsulating the entire plume area?

Jennifer Valenzia: No, just in the higher concentration areas.

Matthew McCarron: The plume in 1996 was much smaller and had not made it to the school property.

Travis Williamson: The concentration decrease over time is somewhat synonymous to a decrease in mass over time. They are just different units of measure.

Sue Lattanzio: Is the entire plume on Navy property?

Jennifer Valenzia: No. The plume extends about 1800 feet north

Joan Dekelboun: Is the MTBE in the aquifer?

Travis Williamson: This is the driest time of year, and there is about a 3-foot fluctuation throughout the seasons.

Pat Eklund: Have the regulatory agencies responded to the request to stop the biosparging?

Jennifer Valenzia: We have not made a formal request yet.

Pat Eklund: Who would approve the halting of the biosparging?

Laurent Meillier: The Water Board put together a memo about shutting off the system, and we have been resistant to that idea. The biosparging is still effective, and we feel that the system could be optimized so that degradation could be enhanced. We are concerned about the migration of the plume downgradient of Navy property. It is not adequate to shut off the system now.

Jennifer Valenzia: We believe that the plume on Navy property is stable and that the concentrations have leveled over the past months. The biosparging treatment treats a very specific property and does not have any effect on the northeast leading edge. Recent samples of soil gas and groundwater indicate

that the US EPA risk thresholds are not exceeded. The Navy believes the system has met its cost objectives and is no longer cost effective to operate.

Ross Millerick: The intended use of that property is to house students. If the DTSC or the Water Board doesn't provide clearance to stop the biosparging, what beneficial use did you use to determine "cost effectiveness"?

Jennifer Valenzia: The property is safe for school use right now.

Ross Millerick: The DTSC has not made that classification.

Jennifer Valenzia: Although have not made that classification, as it stands with the concentrations as they are now, it would not adversely affect the uses on the property. What we mean by cost effective is that we are spending a lot of money and not removing a lot of MTBE.

Joy Lanzaro: Is it that natural attenuation occurs at the same rate as the biosparging at that point?

Jennifer Valenzia: We would have to shut off the system, but we believe that is true.

Maurcia Britto: Are you confident that the property will get approved for school use?

Jennifer Valenzia: Yes.

Jim Davies: There are two arms, the toxics folks and the separate schools system. They will review the information and will decide if additional work needs to be done on the site. The DTSC schools program is interested in lead and arsenic in the area. Until we look at the environmental documents we will not reach a decision. We don't see any significant roadblocks to change the opinions that it will be safe for children to be on the property. There will be a digging restriction in the area, but only for construction workers. The school does not plan to do any work in that area anyway. We are optimistic that the property will be safe for a school. This is about a five to six month process.

### **Ballfields Parcel**

This is the property that will be part of the seasonal wetland restoration project. In order to make that property available for transfer to the Coastal Conservancy we have to do preliminary assessment and a site inspection. We are still working with the regulatory agencies to finalize our work plan.

Ms Valenzia described the next steps:

- Continue routine biosparging operation and monitoring

- Continue discussions with the regulatory agencies on biosparging treatment system effectiveness and transition to the next phase
- Quarterly groundwater monitoring event to be conducted November 2004
- Proceed with property transfer activities
- Develop Final Work Plan for PA/SI at Ballfields Parcel

Jim Davies: At the northern part of the property, there are still high concentrations on MTBE, in several thousand parts per billion. Are those concentrations migrating off-site?

Jennifer Valenzia: We have eliminated those concentrations with the biosparging system. Relative to what the concentrations were before treatment, it is significantly lower.

Jim Davies: So as long as the concentration is below 10,000 ppb it can go offsite and onto the City's parcel.

Jennifer Valenzia: It is not required by the Water Board to clean up the MTBE plume to background levels. Our goal is to reduce concentrations to make the area safe. It might not be economically or technically feasible to completely reduce the MTBE concentrations to nothing. The concentrations are much lower now and we believe that they will not adversely affect property or ecological receptors. It is true that groundwater flows to the north, but there are natural processes that are continuing the degradation of MTBE concentrations.

Travis Williamson: The concentrations off of the Navy property are stable and decreasing over time. The areas of "yellow" are areas of tighter soils where there is diffusion, and we will continue to monitor that. That water is not migrating to the north, but is diffusing out into the preferential flow path. Stabilization and containment is the motto. We will not have higher concentrations moving off of the Navy property. The 6+ years of monitoring data show that the concentrations off of the Navy property are stable and decreasing over time. These hot spot areas that we have been treating for the past two years were not migrating before we started treating them.

Jim Davies: What is being done about the leading edge? There was a small amount of TCE detected, which is coming to the surface during the winter. This is City property. There is surface water in that area as well; where the plume is, groundwater surfaces almost perennially.

Travis Williamson: We are continuing to collect data there on a quarterly basis. We have contacted Jim McAllister to get some more data on the conditions there. The nearest receptor is Pacheco Pond which is about 2400 feet away from the leading edge. We feel we have enough time to look at the situation and see what needs to be done.

For those of you that are interested, I have some information on the sale parcel, which is all taken from our website.

### **FUDS Updates: Jim McAlister, Project Manager for Landfill 26 and North Antenna Field**

Mr. McAlister provided an update on recent methane monitoring at Landfill 26 and the status of the documentation, and issues involving the North Antenna Field.

### **Landfill 26 Methane Monitoring**

All of the vent trench monitoring came up at less than 1 percent for September. At the Hamilton Meadows gas probes, there was 44 percent methane in Lot 30; it has been as high as 60 percent. We were not able to reach some of the lots (29, 27, 20, and 26) due to construction. Sometimes lot 29 will be greater than 5 percent but the others have been low. Lots 28, 27 and 26 have been lower.

Jeff Johnson: Is there a house on lot 30?

Jim McAlister: Yes. The final construction phases are in process.

Jeff Johnson: What are the risks to the owner from the high concentrations of methane?

Jim McAlister: The monitoring is taking place far under the surface. There were various probes at different levels. As you get closer to the atmosphere, there is more air to mix with and therefore the concentration decreases. If the methane reaches the surface, there is even more oxygen to dilute it. We believe that the methane occurring in this area is from naturally occurring methane. There is a rich organic layer of soil under lot 30, and that could be a source of methane.

Sue Latanzio: Is the builder putting in methane mitigation measures?

Jim McAlister: Shea Homes is adopting the criteria of Title 27 to mitigate for methane concentrations. There is an impermeable layer under the house, and a collection and vent system for each house. I cannot tell you specifically which houses have these measures, but every house that backs up to the landfill has them as well as towards the western edge of the property.

### **Document Status**

- Investigation Report: Final and sent to stakeholders, regulatory agencies and public.
- Landfill 26 Comprehensive Monitoring Report: Comments Incorporated
- Monitoring of Remedial Action Probes: Quarterly
- Monitoring of Trench: Quarterly
- Board Order Compliance: 2005-8

We have been doing comprehensive monitoring since October of last year, and we are getting comments back from the regulatory agencies. We are monitoring the buffer trench at the request of the water board. There are two existing Board Orders, and compliance with the first one is due in March 2005.

Jim Davies: I provided comments on the investigation report, and we never went over the comments or got to see the response to comments. Why have we skipped the comment response process this time?

Jim McAlister: There is a lawsuit against the federal government about this project. We talked to the regulatory agencies and we responded to all of the comments and presented them to the agencies. We didn't exclude the public; one of the stakeholders is suing the government for \$155 million. At the advice of our lawyers we addressed every comment that was provided by stakeholders or regulatory agencies and put those responses in the report. We feel we have addressed the obligation to respond to comments.

Sue Latanzio: Does the Board Order compliance include the monitoring of the north and western areas of the landfill?

Jim McAlister: Our efforts were at the southern end of the landfill. The first task is a work plan to see what we need to complete the investigation. We have been collecting data for the past year. We have put in some additional soil gas probes and we believe that we are well on the way to being finished. Originally around the landfill we had 23 monitoring probes, and those are all screened from 3-15 feet deep and they all go into groundwater. When the soil gas monitoring probes are in contact with water, you do not get an accurate measure of the soil gas. We put the probes in shallow soil around the landfill to solely capture soil gas. I believe that we put in about 20.

Jim Davies: Are you doing a work plan? When is that required?

Jim McAlister: That is part of Task One. Compliance is required by March 2005

### **North Antenna Field**

We are currently in the risk assessment phase and the agencies have asked us to look at background numbers. We did that and that data is currently under regulatory review. Once we have comments back from the agencies we can work them into a work plan. We hope to have the risk assessment finalized in March 2005.

There is an ordnance activities work plan in the works, but I can't project a date at this time. Our ordnance specialist will be back in the next couple of weeks and then we will be able to project dates.

We will move on to the feasibility study and will have that to the agencies next summer, and finalize in late 2005. We plan on starting remedial action late in 2006.



Ross Millerick: How does citizen input occur?

Jim McAlister: When documents go to public agencies, there is also a copy put in the public library. If you would like one, please let us know. We have an archive search report which pertains to ordinances. It should be another six to eight weeks until we send the archive search report to the agencies for review.

### **California State Coastal Conservancy Wetlands Project Update: Eric Polson**

Mr. Polson provided an update on the wetland restoration project on Hamilton Field.

We have started construction in the past month and therefore have closed off access to the site by posting notices and sending out a mailing explaining the construction process. Access to the BRAC office is still available, although the office is and has always been in a restricted area. The fine point to the site closure is that the City owns land adjacent to the site. The top of the levee is still open. This is really a human safety issue. The length of time that the property will be closed will be several years, and then the area where the wetlands will be will never be open to public access because it will be a habitat area. The Bay Trail will run along the edge of the project. The City is constructing the Bay Trail on the POL Hill reservoir. Ammo hill is owned by the City and is open for public access, but not for vehicular access.

Ross Millerick: What is the nature of the construction?

Eric Polson: We are constructing the Bulge levee and the Pacheco Pond levee. The other work is the soil scraping and moving out of the tidal wetlands area. There are low levels of DDTs in that area, and as part of the ROD/RAP, the wetlands restoration project inherited the responsibility of cleaning up the area. We are doing that by removing soils. We are moving the soils into the seasonal wetlands area. The construction season is from September to early December. Once construction is done for the year, we will not be actively telling people to leave. The signs will still be posted, but we will not be enforcing.

Jeff Johnson: What access road are you using to get into the wetlands project area with the dump trucks? I am a homeowner adjacent to the neighborhood by Todd Road, and there are dump trucks coming and going at 2 a.m. and at 6 a.m. For this to be going on for years is a nightmare. There are many homes that back up to Todd Road. Shea Homes did not disclose information about this access road when the homes were sold. Is there an alternate route?

Eric Polson: The access road is by Landfill 26 by Todd Road. Please call the number that was posted on the front of the newsletter if there are any issues. I did get a call about vehicular traffic late at night and called my contractors and it turned out to be a refueling truck. Now we have a diesel tank on site, and there should not be any more nighttime activity.

Jeff Johnson: Not only are we talking about the flow of traffic, but we are talking about continuous dust flying around. Our master bedroom looks out on the road, and I am concerned about not only the early morning disruptions but also about the dust. Shea had a duty to disclose this information, and our joy of home ownership is being disrupted, and I think that we will have to approach Shea. They should not have built homes on a construction access road that was going to be used for that purpose for 10 plus years.

Eric Polson: In all of our design and environmental documents, that road has always been shown as our heavy haul access. There is a lot of truck traffic that is coming through Todd Road that is not associated with the wetlands project. We are not off-hauling any material right now. The only thing that is coming in and out is heavy equipment and workers. We will be hauling road base in, but we are bringing nothing out. Our activities are from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. If there is a dust problem that is associated with our project, please let us know and we will take appropriate measures.

Pat Eklund: It is my understanding that Todd Road is owned by the City and is not an improved road. How has the California Coastal Conservancy received permission to use an unimproved road? We are looking to close off that road due to many problems.

Jim Davies: The City owns Todd Road up to the buffer zone of the Landfill.

Eric Polson: The road is paved. We had a meeting with everyone about the access and use of the road. We are working closely with the police department, and to reduce the problems on the roads. In our transfer documents with the Army, access to Todd Road is included so we will revisit that.

Pat Eklund: The road is not paved to City standards.

Ed Keller: The army did retain access easements on that road.

Pat Eklund: We have had other problems out there, with off-road vehicles, and the police have been out there. We should look at what options we have to close off that road.

Eric Polson: We are working closely with the police. We had a meeting with the City at the BRAC Building and I invited the Novato Sanitary District, the Mosquito Abatement District, Water District, BRAC, FUDS, everyone that uses that property to sit down and talk to the City. We got some direction about the proper posting and need to get letters so that the police department can appropriately cite people.

Pat Eklund: I will also check to make sure the contractors that we have hired for the Bay Trail are using the area appropriately.

Naomi Feger: What is the status of the recycling facility?

Jim Davies: It will go until next spring or summer; we do have an agreement with the City that they have to restore the area.

Eric Polson: The ultimate plan for that area is athletic fields and other recreational uses.

Jim McAlister: With the Landfill there, we don't want people accessing that area. I proposed to Ken to put a fence at Hamilton Parkway with gate access to Todd Road. After the nine-month expected life on the recycling facility, a fence would help with the nighttime activities.

Pat Eklund: Can you send me a letter that says you will pay for it?

Jim McAlister: I didn't say I was going to pay for it, but maybe we can do a joint funding.

Maurcia Britto: If one of the concerns is dust on Todd Road, there are dust control measures that can be implemented, like sweeping.

Eric Polson: We should not be the source of dust problems, because we are not bringing materials out.

Naomi Feger: I think that it has to be swept. The City knows how to keep the excess sediment from flowing into the storm drains.

Ed Keller: There are no storm drains

Joy Lanzaro: What is worse? The dust problem or the noise of street sweepers trying to mitigate the dust?

Eric Polson: We would mitigate the dust problem with a water truck that we have on-site. The big point is that we have hauled property onto the site, but we are not hauling massive amounts of trucks or materials. All that we are doing is mostly internal to our site, until we are bringing in the road base to put on the top of the levee. There are a handful of projects in this area.

Sabrina Molinari: Who has the authority to determine what all of the projects are in the area are doing and the timeline for each?

Eric Polson: All of the people in this room are people who have activity in the area. I can't speak to all of the City's projects. The BRAC has various projects out there, Jim McAlister has some projects, and I represent the wetlands restoration. That is all three projects that are on the airfield and the state lands parcel. The

City, I would assume, has jurisdiction over all of their contractors, including the recycling yard, which has a large amount of traffic. There is also a contractor that is staged at the corner of Hamilton Parkway and Todd Road. I can't speak to all of the City's projects.

Jim McAlister: Next week I will have 20-30 trucks hauling in the area.

Sue Lattanzio: There are also a lot of local residents who use the Todd Road area as recreation area on the weekends, so bringing trucks on a Saturday is not comfortable for the residents.

Eric Polson: That hasn't been a big problem yet, but will be once the weather gets nice again. The City has posted that there should be no vehicles beyond the site boundary, so that should take care of the people problem in the future. There is a whole row of signs establishing a vehicle limit, which is a City posting, which I assume will be enforced by the police department.

Jeff Johnson: Is there no alternative road which is not adjacent to a residential neighborhood?

Eric Polson: There is no alternative road that I know of. The only other access onto the airfield is the Coast Guard area, which is a restricted area. After 9/11 and homeland security they do not want people there. The wetland project would support putting a fence in the area, and might even be open to helping to fund it.

Jeff Johnson: No trespassing signs are well and good, but people have no respect for those signs, and there has to be a stronger deterrent, such as a fence. We proposed a fence at a City Council meeting some months ago. This is very disappointing to the residents around Todd Road.

Pat Eklund: Lets have an offline conversation with the agencies that can help solve this problem; I will help to initiate that. Maybe we need a security guard out there, but let's get the people together in a room to solve this issue.

Harvey Abernathy: What types of measures have been taken to exterminate or mitigate the wildlife that exists in that area now? I live in the southern area of the wetland restoration project, and we are seeing some heavy activity with coyotes, rabbits and rodents that are being moved off of that property. Have there been any mitigation measures to move them away or exterminate them to keep them from the public corridors?

Eric Polson: We have no extermination project for wildlife; we are in the business of building wildlife habitats, not exterminating them. We do have an active rabbit population, and where you have rabbits you have coyotes: we also have deer out here as well as small mammals as well as birds of prey. Some of the wildlife

spends time in the marsh, and there is a corridor that extends all the way from the Petaluma River through McGuiness Park. We are affecting about 100 acres of a 600-acre site. There are plenty of places for the animals to go without them going into a residential subdivision which has lots of cats and dogs.

Harvey Abernathy: About two weeks ago there was a pack of coyotes, there was a pack of coyotes in the pump station area on the levee road behind Southgate, and they were after some animal. They are getting a lot closer in the past couple of months. There should be some mitigation to the existing wildlife which is being displaced. We are concerned about the coyotes and the children.

Eric Polson: Coyotes are increasing their activities in the US. This is not just an issue for Hamilton. This is because a lot of the higher order predators of the coyotes have been eliminated. There are also lots of issues with the red fox as well. I don't think our activities out there have any affect one way or the other on the coyote population.

Joy Lanzaro: The coyotes could be moving into residential areas where the prey is easy, when people keep their cats outside at night, which are predated upon by coyotes.

Eric Polson: Coyotes are pretty ubiquitous.

### **Final Site Design**

We are in our final site design process for the Airfield portion of the site. We are going to try to finish all of the permitting by next spring. Then we will be back in construction next spring and summer, building two additional levee pieces that will contain the panhandle. That will be built with dredge material from the Port of Oakland which will arrive in the fall of 2005. The placement of the Oakland dredge material could take up to a year, from October 2005-October 2006. The entire project will take 10.6 million cubic yards of material to construct. The vast amount of materials will be brought in by barge and will be hydrologically placed onshore, so there will not be a lot of activity shore-side.

Pat Eklund: Is all of the dredge material from Oakland?

Eric Polson: 2.5 million cubic yards will come from the Oakland project, and about 1.8 cubic million yards of sand.

Eric Polson: This is the existing open water disposal area; there are two of them, SF9 and SF10. These are areas that are open water dredge material dump sites; the material that gets dumped there gets dispersed with the tides and currents. The area that we will have our facilities in is adjacent to or inside of SF10. There will be a corridor that goes to Hamilton or up to Bel Marin Keys eventually. For the initial part, there will be a pipeline and a facility to pump the materials about five miles. Typically it could be electric or diesel. This type of off loader is quiet

from land. In the original Hamilton EIR/EIS we envisioned an off loader pumping the dredge material onshore. There is a barge of dredge of material and a snorkel pumps ashore 10-15 percent solids and 90 percent water. When this slurry comes into the site, you can move the materials around and decant water to hold onsite and then discharge it back into the Bay. This is what will be in the Bay first.

Marucia Britto: If this is five miles off-shore, how are you going to bring the materials into the levee? How much material are you going to be able to put on that levee? I think that it is important for the dredge materials to come from Oakland.

Eric Polson: There is already a pipeline, and we have installed a section of pipe which goes 300 feet into the Bay and 300 feet into our site, which is out of the area of concern for the clapper rail. The pipe can be moved around to get the material around. The entire seasonal wetland area would take around 2.3 million cubic yards, so we are getting about 2.5 million cubic yards from the Port of Oakland. I expect we will use about 2 million cubic yards.

Marucia Britto: The permitting process takes a long time; sometimes more than six months. Have you already applied for the permits?

Eric Polson: We have been in consultation with the agencies, but have not submitted any permit applications. We will be doing a supplemental environmental impact report on the option on having an aquatic transfer facility (confined or unconfined) instead of a hydraulic off loader.

Eric Polson: The project is going to be taking dredge materials from a variety of sources over the life of the project. Once we start having a variety of projects happening at once, the off-loader becomes less feasible. You have one machine and many locations for the dredge. We were looking for a more cost-effective way to maximize the wetland restoration project. What we came up with was a rehandling basin (aquatic transfer facility). This basin would be in the vicinity of San Pablo Bay, and there would still be equipment off shore that would pump dredge onshore. We are looking at this aquatic transfer facility as an alternative and have taken it to the Long Term Management Strategies (LTMS) committee and to various environmental groups and regulatory agencies. These are two of the many alternatives that we will look at. We will do a supplemental environmental impact report/statement on this alone within the next two years. The concept is that instead of having a fixed facility to which the barges come and tie up to, there would be a facility where you could have several different types of vessels come and deposit dredge material. Basically, there would be a hole in the Bay, the material would be dredged to create that hole, and would be put in the Hamilton site. There would then be different lanes where you could keep segregated material. This would give the project an advantage in the fact that we could selectively move material on-site and use it to its best advantage,

instead of having to deal with each barge load one unit at a time. Many activities could go on concurrently with the aquatic transfer facility. These are conceptual at this time, and will go over the environmental review process.

Lance McMahan: The Army Corps of Engineers did a report for Congress called the military munitions report, and this site is in a bombing range. The report is on the Army Corps website.

Eric Polson: On the other side of San Pablo Bay there was a live gunnery range that we are aware of. Any area that we have looked at, we will look at the historical and current uses. I am interested in looking at the report.

Laurent Meillier: What is the purpose of deepening San Pablo Bay? I have heard that the Bay is sediment starved.

Eric Polson: I don't know if I would call the bay "sediment starved". We would only be dredging a small amount to store and handle the fill material, and then we would fill it back up when we are done. Even though we are only proposing 10 years, that is looked at as a permanent project.

Laurent Meillier: How are you going to deal with the boat traffic?

Eric Polson: This facility would be outside of the ship channel, and outside the area of boat traffic. A large ship would run aground before it would be able to reach the wetland transfer area.

Jim Davies: Will the proposed ferry service affect the proposed transfer facility?

Eric Polson: No, there are almost three foot waves every day and the transfer facility is outside the navigation channel.

Naomi Feger: The CEQA window is a two year process? How will the materials make it onto the site in the next couple of months?

Eric Polson: They will make it through the hydraulic off-loader which has already been approved. We are just trying to come up with a better solution.

Eric Polson: We have a specific authorization both in our federal legislation and in the Port of Oakland's federal legislation to take the dredge materials. Then we have the authorization to receive federal maintenance materials.

Jim Davies: Like San Rafael?

Eric Polson: I am not sure. We are still working on the system. I doubt that any materials would be forced to come to Hamilton.

## **Army BRAC Update: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) Documentation and Next Steps**

### **Documentation**

The Remedial Action Work Plan was distributed on August 11, 2004 and now we are implementing the remedies under that plan. The Plan covers three sites, the unlined perimeter drainage ditch, the south of runway DDT hotspot, and revetment demolition. The revetment is a joint project with the wetland project to remove the concrete pads, and was set up in one contract. The concrete pads are being removed to assess the contamination below them and also because they are in an area where channels might develop.

### **Field Work**

- South of Runway DDT Hotspot Investigation - Sampling completed in June, excavation next spring/summer due to lack of current funding and after rainy season
- Unlined PDD DDT Hotspot – The hotspot is in the way of levee work progressing, and we are moving ahead on the excavation of the drainage ditch with current available funding. We would have 90 days to remove the materials offsite
- Revetment Demolition - excavations are scheduled to be completed by summer 2005.

We are moving ahead on the unlined drainage ditch, and will be using Todd Road for access. The materials would be going to a hazardous waste facility.

Marucia Britto: How many trucks are you going to need to transport the materials offsite?

Ed Keller: Around 60 loads, which would take about a week to a week and a half. Standard hours of operation are from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Naomi Feger: Is there a way to mitigate the sound?

Ed Keller: No, they are diesel trucks.

Eric Polson: Compression brakes are loud and we can ask the drivers not to use them.

Mathew McCarron: Is there another sanitary district project in the area? Aren't they moving that plant at some point?

Ed Keller: Yes, there are chemical tankers coming in frequently, usually around mid-day and there are other trucks on-site all day long.



Eric Polson: The Coastal Conservancy is working with the Novato Sanitary District now, and we are working on the design that will replace the dechlorination facility. There will be traffic this year which won't exist after this year.

### **Property Transfer Status**

All of the property transfers are complete.

### **Next Steps**

Main Airfield: Regarding the coastal salt marsh, we have been sitting down with the regulators. Our construction runs in the winter (September through January) to avoid the clapper rail breeding season. The sampling that we have going on right now is to better define the contaminants in the area. Approximately 20-30,000 cubic yards of material will not be offloaded until next summer unless it is hazardous waste. Meetings are already scheduled with Fish and Wildlife service. No walking will be allowed on the outboard levee once we get construction vehicles out there.

For POL Hill, we still have long term monitoring responsibilities. The Army plans to close those out next summer. Our sampling over the last four to five years has shown that the plume is stable and is not migrating and proposing a threat to the open space use of that property.

### **Regulatory Agency Comments**

None were made.

### **Meeting Wrap-up and Adjournment: Ed Keller**

Mr. Keller announced that the next meeting will be held on January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005.